



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/924,972	08/09/2001	Giancarlo Bisazza	07881.0011	3149

7590 11/18/2003

Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow
Garrett & Dunner, LLP
1300 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3315

EXAMINER

HAWKINS, CHERYL N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1734

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

11

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/924,972

Applicant(s)

BISAZZA ET AL.

Examiner

Cheryl N Hawkins

Art Unit

1734

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Cheryl N Hawkins.

(3) Raul Das.

(2) Naoki Yoshida.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 05 November 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Brinkmeier (US 3,899,385).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


CURTIS MAYES
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Cheryl N. Hawkins 4/10/03
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: This telephonic interview was held at the request of Attorney Yoshida to discuss a proposed amendment to Claim 1. Attorneys Yoshida and Das highlighted the most important aspect of the proposed amendment which is the recitation of a device having application means for applying a sheet over a panel of mosaic tesserae, the application means including cutting means which are capable of producing cut sheets of varying sizes and suction drum rotating means having a plurality of holes which are positioned circumferentially and axially on the surface of the suction drum for effectively retaining and releasing the cut sheet material as desired. Upon consideration of the highlighted portions of the amendment proposed by Attorneys Yoshida and Das, Examiner Hawkins informed the attorneys that while the proposed amendment may overcome the rejection previously submitted based on the prior art of record to Brinkmeier, receipt of the amendment in an official manner would necessitate further search and consideration.

Regarding the attorneys' inquiry concerning the receipt of the second office action, the Examiner reemphasizes that the second office action is considered to be non-final as indicated on the PTO-326 accompanying the action.